

From: Kevin Ulland
To: Microsoft Settlement
Date: 1/14/02 12:53pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

Kevin Ulland
6453 139th Place NE #41
Redmond, WA 98052

January 14, 2002

Microsoft Settlement
U.S. Department of Justice-Antitrust Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Microsoft Settlement:

The Microsoft trial squandered taxpayers' dollars, was a nuisance to consumers, and a serious deterrent to investors in the high-tech industry. It is high time for this trial, and the wasteful spending accompanying it, to be over. Consumers will indeed see competition in the marketplace, rather than the courtroom. And the investors who propel our economy can finally breathe a sigh of relief.

Upwards of 60% of Americans thought the federal government should not have broken up Microsoft. If the case is finally over, companies like Microsoft can get back into the business of innovating and creating better products for consumers, and not wasting valuable resources on litigation.

Competition means creating better goods and offering superior services to consumers. With government out of the business of stifling progress and tying the hands of corporations, consumers - rather than bureaucrats and judges - will once again pick the winners and losers on Wall Street. With the reins off the high-tech industry, more entrepreneurs will be encouraged to create new and competitive products and technologies.

I fully support the settlement between the nine states, the DOJ and Microsoft. I don't believe Microsoft is a monopoly that has abused its power, and Microsoft hasn't ever hurt me, the CONSUMER. But that's not what's at issue here.

I believe that the settlement that the DOJ and Microsoft agreed to is fine. It not only tackles the anti-trust "violations" but also addresses the market and Microsoft's role therein. I am happy to see that nine of the eighteen states have signed on, but I am frustrated by the remaining states who wish to proceed with the trial. I have a question about those

nine states.

I live in Washington State. I am happy with Microsoft, I like Windows XP and it's features. I use Passport and love the fact that it's integrated into the OS. It saves me time! I love Internet Explorer. It renders beautiful web sites, and being a web developer, it's a great application. Netscape is non-compliant with the standards and mis-interprets code all of the time, creating ugly sites and interfaces. I DON'T want Microsoft to stop innovating. I want the next version of Windows to be even more rich with features. If Massachusetts or California go into the hearings in March and get extra sanctions or limitations applied to the deal with Microsoft, those limitations had better not effect me here in Washington, or any of the other 41 states! Just because California is listening to the special interest groups from Silicon Valley and Microsoft competitors and NOT it's consumers, that should not affect me in my state. I remember my US history, and I remember that we all started out as separate states, like little nations, and we created a federal government to over see national issues. But laws passed in California do not apply in any other state, and I am hoping that a ruling against Microsoft for California, or the other nine states only applies in those states. If California law can't affect me here in Washington, why should a ruling for California affect me as well? Will a ruling for the nine states affect the other 41?

Please answer this question, because I think it is vitally important that as a consumer I know what is going to happen to Microsoft and the software I use in my life and work. It is wholly unacceptable that these nine states' problems with Microsoft affect the rest of the nation. The settlement with the DOJ can affect all of the states, because it is an agreement with the Federal Government...

Thank you for this opportunity to share my views,
Kevin Ulland
kevinu@intentionallyu.com
Citizen of Washington State

Sincerely,

Kevin Ulland